

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/538,550	WALKER, ANDREW
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael W. Talbot	3722

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael W. Talbot (USPTO).

(3) Mr. W.R. Duke Taylor (attorney).

(2) Ms. Dana Ross (USPTO).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 15 November 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: N/A.

Claim(s) discussed: Claims 1 and 6.

Identification of prior art discussed: Prior art of Record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

#### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: It was agreed upon by all parties that the proposed attached amendments to independent claims 1 and 6 appears to overcome the prior art of record (eliminates any rotational movement of any component to move the jaws). Attorney was kindly requested to file an official response inclusive of the proposed attached amendments for Examiners consideration. An Advisory Action is expected to be forthcoming since these proposed amendments are After Final and will require a more in-depth consideration and/or search of the prior art to determine final patentability.



Harness Dickey & Pierce PLC  
 Attorneys and Counselors  
 5445 Corporate Drive, Suite 200  
 Troy, Michigan 48098-2683  
 Phone: 248-641-1600 Fax: 248-641-0270  
 Metropolitan: Detroit St. Louis Washington, DC

DATE: November 14, 2006

NO. OF PAGES (INCLUDING THIS PAGE): 3

FOR: Examiner Michael W. Talbot	ORIGINAL WILL FOLLOW BY:
COMPANY: United States Patent and Trademark Office	<input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR MAIL <input type="checkbox"/> OVERNIGHT MAIL <input type="checkbox"/> COURIER <input type="checkbox"/> WILL NOT FOLLOW
FAX No.: (571) 273-4481	PHONE:

FROM: W.R. Duke Taylor

Please let us know by phone or fax if you do not receive any of these pages.

## COMMENTS:

Group Art Unit: 3722  
 Examiner: Michael W. Talbot  
 Serial No. 09/538,550  
 Inventors: Andrew Walker  
 Filing Date: March 29, 2000  
 Title: DRILL/DRIVER CHUCK

Attorney Docket No. 0275S-001193

### PROPOSED CLAIMS FOR INTERVIEW

## NOTICE

The information contained in this fax transmission is intended only for the individual to whom or entity to which it is addressed. It may also contain privileged, confidential, attorney work product or trade secret information which is protected by law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the addressee, the reader is hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original message to us at the address above via the U.S. Postal Service. We will reimburse you for any reasonable expense (including postage) for the return of the original message.

Group Art Unit: 3722  
Examiner: Michael W. Talbot  
Serial No. 09/538,550  
Inventors: Andrew Walker  
Filing Date: March 29, 2000  
Title: DRILL/DRIVER CHUCK

Attorney Docket No. 0275S-001193

## PROPOSED CLAIMS FOR INTERVIEW

1. (Currently Amended) A drill/driver chuck including:

    cylindrical member having a central axis bore and a plurality of further bores such that the plurality of further bores are slanted with respect to the axis of the cylindrical member;

    a plurality of jaws, each jaw being associated with a respective one of the further bores and moveable therewith;

    a conical jaw actuator, coupled to each of the jaws of the plurality, for moving the jaws within their respective further bores, the jaw actuator having a conical shape with walls of the cone having a plurality of slots formed therein such that each slot co-operates with a respective one of the plurality of jaws and wherein movement of the jaw actuator is non-rotational in a direction along the axis of the cylindrical member which causes concomitant movement of the jaws within their respective slots in a radial direction with respect to the axis of the cylindrical member;

    the chuck characterized in that ~~no one component part rotates relative to any other component part thereof~~ the cylindrical member, plurality of jaws and conical actuator do not rotate relative to one another to enable transitional movement along the axis.

6. (Currently Amended) A chuck including:

a cylindrical member having a central axial bore formed along the longitudinal axis of the cylindrical member and a plurality of further bores such that the plurality of further bores are slanted with respect to the longitudinal axis of the cylindrical member;

a plurality of jaws, each jaw being associated with a respective one of the further bores and moveable therewithin;

a conical jaw actuator, coupled to each of the jaws of the plurality, for moving the jaws within their respective further bores, the jaw actuator having a conical shape with walls of the cone having a plurality of slots formed therein such that each slot co-operates with a respective one of the plurality of jaws and wherein movement of the jaw actuator in a direction along the axis of the cylindrical member causes concomitant movement of the jaws within their respective slots in a radial direction with respect to the axis of the cylindrical member; and

a thrust plate coupled to the jaw actuator, the thrust plate non-rotatably movable on the cylindrical member along the longitudinal axis in order to apply movement force to the jaw actuator, said thrust plate constrained against rotational movement about the longitudinal axis so that said thrust plate does not rotate relative to said cylindrical member during said movement.

Best Available Copy